

## Remarks

Claims 1 through 6, 8 through 10 and 12 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Blatt '468. Claims 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blatt '468. Claims 11 and 15 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blatt '468 in view of Hansen '307. The Examiner has, however, indicated that claim 7 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome any possible rejections under 35 USC 112 second paragraph and to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 102 for the following reasons.

The Blatt reference describes a vacuum control apparatus having two nozzle branches with each nozzle branch having a narrow location for generating a vacuum in an attached or adjacent vacuum conduit. However, the Applicant respectfully submits that Blatt fails to disclose at least one secondary nozzle branch having a closing member disposed upstream with respect to the driving gas flow direction, which is driven in dependence on a pressure of the driving gas into the injector. In formulating the Office Action, the Examiner has referred to closing instrument 41b of Blatt. However, this closing instrument 41b is a solenoid switching valve (see column 4 beginning with line 48 as well of column 6 lines 54 through 57). This valve is not used in the Blatt reference to respond to pressure differences from the input air source for switching on and off introduction of pressurized air to the corresponding nozzle, rather is simply used as an electromagnetic valve to control a path

through which the pressurized air flows and thereby operation of a plurality of nozzles. (See in particular column 8 lines 7 through 15 of the Blatt reference). These electromagnetic valves function for vacuum dependent control of Blatt's multiple nozzle system (see for example figures 4 and 5).

In contrast thereto, the present invention recites limitations for the secondary branch which specify that the closing instrument operates in dependence on the inlet pressure of the driver gas to the injector. The Applicant has carefully reviewed the Blatt reference and finds no suggestion through the entire disclosure of Blatt for operation of the closing valve 41 in dependence on the input pressure of the driving gas. The invention therefore discloses a feature not present in the prior art of record and is sufficiently distinguished from that prior art to satisfy the requirements of 35 USC 102. The dependent claims inherit the limitations of the base claim and are therefore similarly distinguished from the references of record for the reasons given. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to reconsider the US PTO position in this case and to pass this application on to issuance of a United States patent.

4

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Vincent

Dr. Paul Vincent

Registration number 37,461

Feb. 09, 2007

Date

Dreiss, Fuhlendorf, Steimle & Becker

Patentanwälte

Postfach 10 37 62

D-70032 Stuttgart

Germany

Telephone: 49-711-24 89 38-0

Fax : 49-711-24 89 38-99